

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-36, and 38-48 are pending in the application, with Claims 1, 20, and 38 being independent. Applicant amends Claims 1, 20, and 38 to further clarify the subject matter. Support for the claim amendments and additions can be found in the original disclosure at least in paragraphs 0005 and 0006. Thus, no new matter has been added.

SPECIFICATION OBJECTIONS

The specification stands objected to because of failing to provide proper antecedent basis. Claims 1 and 38 were objected to for not reciting “a first format” and “a second format” because the Specification does not provide antecedent basis. Applicant amends Claims 1 and 38. Accordingly, Applicant requests withdrawal of the specification objections.

§ 112 FIRST PARAGRAPH REJECTIONS

Claims 1 and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicant amends Claims 1 and 38 to comply with § 112, ¶ 1. Accordingly, Applicant requests withdrawal of the § 112, ¶ 1 rejection.

§ 103 REJECTIONS: A., B., AND C.

A. Claims 1, 3, 4, 12, 13, 18, 20-23, 30, 31, 36, 38-40, 43, and 48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,638,448-A to Nguyen. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Without conceding the propriety of the stated rejections, and only to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant amends independent **Claim 1**, to clarify further features of the subject matter. Independent **Claim 1** as amended, now recites:

A method of processing multiple types of security schemes, comprising:

receiving a message having a first token and a second token, wherein the first token and the second token are different from each other, while associated with a same subject;

extracting claims from one or more different types of security tokens corresponding to multiple security schemes, wherein a claim is a statement about a security token's subject that allows security schemes to be based on the extracted claims;

authenticating the first token by extracting a first claim from the first token and authenticating the second token by extracting a second claim from the second token, wherein the first and second claims comprise different statements about the subject;

grouping the first and second claims into a claim collection by selectively mapping the first claim and the second claim to other claims;

determining a resource being accessed by extracting or obtaining resource identifiers from a message at run-time or examining a static configuration of a service;

authorizing access to the resource referred to in the message based at least in part on the first and second claims; and

supporting multiple security schemes for the method.

Applicant respectfully submits that Nguyen fails to disclose, teach, or suggest such a method.

Applicant understands that Examiner Louie tentatively agrees that the proposed amendments overcome the outstanding rejections based on Nguyen. Nguyen is directed towards a network with secure communications sessions using a three way password

authentication, encrypting different portions of a logon packet with different keys based on the nature of the communication link (Title, col. 1, line 65 to col. 2, line 3). Nguyen mentions the heart of the procedure is in the middle part of the logon packet, which contains the random number Ra and CRC signatures (col. 6, lines 24-26). This is a different function than Applicant's amended Claim 1.

Applicant submits that Nguyen fails to disclose, teach, or suggest “*extracting claims from one or more different types of security tokens corresponding to multiple security schemes, wherein a claim is a statement about a security token's subject that allows security schemes to be based on the extracted claims; determining a resource being accessed by extracting or obtaining resource identifiers from a message at run-time or examining a static configuration of a service; supporting multiple security schemes for the method*”, as recited in Applicant's amended Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the evidence relied upon by the Office no longer supports the rejections made under §103 against Applicant's amended Claim 1 and requests that the §103 rejections be withdrawn.

Independent Claims 20 and 38 are directed to a system and a computer-readable storage media, respectively, and each is allowable for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to Claim 1.

Without conceding the propriety of the stated rejections, and only to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant amends independent **Claim 20**, to clarify further features of the subject matter. Independent **Claim 20** as amended, now recites:

A system configured to process multiple types of security schemes, the system comprising:
one or more computer processors; and

one or more computer readable storage media, executable by the one or more computer processors, to store:

a first module to extract claims from one or more different types of security tokens corresponding to multiple security schemes, wherein a claim is a statement about a security token's subject that allows security schemes to be based on the extracted claims;

the first module to extract a first claim from a first token and a second claim from a second token associated with a message, wherein the message has an associated subject and the first claim and the second claim comprise different statements related to the subject;

a second module to selectively map the first claim and the second claim to other claims;

the second module to determine a resource being accessed by extracting or obtaining resource identifiers from a message at run-time; and

the second module to authorize access to the resource referred to in the message based at least in part on the first and second claims.

Applicant respectfully submits that Nguyen fails to disclose, teach, or suggest such a system.

Without conceding the propriety of the stated rejections, and only to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant amends independent **Claim 38**, to clarify further features of the subject matter. Independent **Claim 38** as amended, now recites:

A computer-readable storage medium storing computer-executable instructions that, executed by a processor, performs acts comprising:

receiving a message having a first token and a second token, wherein the first token and the second token are different from each other, but associated with a same subject;

extracting claims from one or more different types of security tokens corresponding to multiple security schemes, wherein a claim is a statement about a security token's subject that allows security schemes to be based on the extracted claims;

obtaining a first claim from the first token and a second claim from the second token, wherein the first and second claims comprise different statements about the subject;

selectively mapping the first claim and the second claim to other claims;. and

authorizing access to a resource referred to in the message based at least in part on the first and second claims.

Applicant respectfully submits that Nguyen fails to disclose, teach, or suggest such a computer-readable medium.

Dependent Claims 3, 4, 12, 13, 18, 21-23, 30, 31, 36, 39-40, 43, and 48 depend directly or indirectly from one of independent Claims 1, 20, and 38, respectively, and are allowable by virtue of this dependency. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features that, in combination with those recited in Claims 1, 20, and 38, are not disclosed, taught, or suggested by Nguyen. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the §103 rejections be withdrawn.

B. Claims 2, 6, 10, 11, 14-17, 24, 26-29, 32-35, 41, 42, and 44-47 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable under US Patent Number 5,638,448-A to Nguyen in view of US Patent Number 6,854,056 to Benantar et al. (hereinafter “Benantar”).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections at least because 1) the references lack all of the recited features in the claims and 2) there is no articulated reasoning to modify and to combine the references.

First, as explained above with respect to the rejection under §102, Applicant submits that Nguyen no longer discloses the features of independent Claims 1, 20, and 38. **Dependent Claims 2, 6, 8, 10, 11, 14-17, 24, 26-29, 32-35, 41, 42, and 44-47** depend directly or indirectly from one of independent Claims 1, 20, and 38, respectively, and are allowable by virtue of this dependency. Applicant understands Examiner Louie to tentatively agree the amendments overcome the references.

Applicant asserts a *prima facie* case of obviousness is no longer established against the independent amended claims. Applicant submits that Nguyen fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the features recited in **independent Claims 1, 20, and 38**. Applicant agrees with

the Office that Nguyen fails to disclose, teach, or suggest “obtaining another claim from the token” (Office Action, pg. 12).

Second, Applicant submits that Benantar fails to remedy the deficiencies of Nguyen. Benantar is directed towards coupling identities by using digital certificates; allowing a client to be authenticated for a variety of services without the services modifying their existing authentication methods. In Benantar, the client generates a request for a digital certificate containing a host identity for a targeted host and secret data associated with its host identity. (Column 2, lines 29-56).

Nguyen and/or Benantar fail to disclose, teach, or suggest, “*extracting claims from one or more different types of security tokens corresponding to multiple security schemes, wherein a claim is a statement about a security token’s subject that allows security schemes to be based on the extracted claims*”, as recited in Applicant’s amended Claims 1, 20, and 38. Nowhere in Nguyen and/or Benantar is there any discussion or mention of the amended features in Applicant’s amended Claims 1, 20, and 38. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the evidence relied upon by the Office no longer supports the rejections made under §103.

Third, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness... KSR Int’l Corp. v. Teleflex, Inc., Slip Op. at 14 (U.S. Apr. 30, 20076) (quoting In re Kahn, 441 F.3d 977, 988 (CA Fed. 2006)). The Office stated it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant’s invention to include, “*obtaining another claim from the token, obtaining a resource identifier from the message, the resource identifier comprises a property of the message, the resource identifier comprises a property of the computing system’s runtime environment, a resource corresponding to the resource identifier is stored by the computing*

system, obtaining a third claim from the first claim, the token is received out-of-band from the message” in the invention as disclosed by Nguyen for the purposes of providing additional information for verifying a user’s identity through the usage of digital certificates (Office Action, pgs. 13-19). Applicant respectfully disagrees with this modification and submits that this modification is not well reasoned, because there is nothing in either of the references that would suggest this reason.

Furthermore, there is no articulated reason with some rational underpinning to support this rejection. Instead, the asserted reason relies on hindsight without evidence of articulated reasoning to propose the suggested modification. This rejection is improper for this additional reason.

Dependent Claims 2, 6, 8, 10, 11, 14-17, 24, 26-29, 32-35, 41, 42, and 44-47 depend directly or indirectly from one of independent Claims 1, 20, and 38, respectively, and are allowable by virtue of this dependency. These dependent claims are also allowable for their own recited features that, in combination with those recited in Claims 1, 20, and 38, are not disclosed, taught, or suggested by Nguyen and/or Benantar, alone or in combination. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the §103 rejections be withdrawn.

C. Claims 7 and 25 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable under US Patent Number 5,638,448-A to Nguyen in view of US Patent Number 6,854,056 to Benantar et al. (hereinafter “Benantar”), and further in view of XML Path Language to Clark (hereinafter “Clark”).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections at least because 1) the references lack all of the recited features in the claims and 2) there is no articulated reasoning to modify and to combine the references.

As explained above with respect to the rejection under §102, Applicant submits that Nguyen no longer discloses the features of independent Claims 1 and 20. **Dependent Claims 7 and 25** depend directly or indirectly from one of independent Claims 1 and 20, respectively, and are allowable by virtue of this dependency. Applicant understands Examiner Louie to tentatively agree the amendments to independent Claims 1 and 20 overcome the references.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the evidence relied upon by the Office no longer supports the rejections made under §103 against Applicant’s amended Claims 1 and 20 and requests that the §103 rejections be withdrawn.

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references do not render the claimed subject matter obvious and that the claimed subject matter, therefore, patentably distinguishes over the cited references. For all of these reasons, the §103 rejection of these claims should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-36, and 38-48 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt allowance of the subject application. If any issue remains unresolved that would prevent allowance of this case, the Office is requested to contact the undersigned attorney to resolve the issue.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
601 W. Riverside Avenue, Suite 1400
Spokane, WA 99201

Dated: December 18, 2008

By: /Shirley Lee Anderson/
Shirley Lee Anderson
Reg. No. 57,763
Phone No. 509-944-4758